UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,046	12/30/2003	Shailendra Garg	OIC0194US	9148

60975   7590   03/02/2010
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE
BLDG. H, SUITE 250
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER
THOMPSON, MICHAEL M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/02/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 October 2009*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: It is unclear as to what Applicant considers to be "another

format" a "target format" and a "target application" as claimed. The specification fails to

recite any subject matter and/or what is encompassed by such subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.   Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, Applicant's use of the term

"another format" is unclear and appears to lack support.

4.   More importantly, with respect to claims 1, 8, 11, 15, 18, 20, and 22-23 recite, in

part, "the opportunity data model provides the common format, the common format

facilitates transforming data stored in the common format to data stored in another

format, the data stored in the common format is stored at the integration server, and the

data stored in the another format is stored at a system of one of the entities." These

limitations do not appear to be supported by the originally filed specification. In particular, in addition to the use of the term "another format," the specification does not appear to support "common format data stored at the integration server" and "data stored in another format is stored at a system of one of the entities." There does not appear to be any recitation as to where data is stored, especially in relationship to the common format, another format, and the servers or entities.

5.   In addressing claim 6 and similar claims reciting the target format, it appears that neither "target format" or "another format" appear to be supported. Further this claim appears to equate target and another as the same format. It is particularly unclear due to Applicant's previous explanation of support for "source format." Furthermore, the term "target application" is unclear and does not appear to be supported for Applicant's invention. In particular, paragraph [0038] is the only mention of a target application and appears to refer to other systems to contrast mapping in other systems. It also appears that the original disclosure does not mention the target/another format representing the data as another opportunity data model. This appears to suggest that there are two different types or two simultaneous opportunity data models.

6.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7.   Claims 1-7, 11-14, 18-19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8.   Claims 1, 11, 18, and 22 recite the limitation "the common format". There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in
> public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in
> the United States.

10.   **Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being**

anticipated by Chin (WO 01143031).

11.   **With respect to claim 1,** Chin teaches a method in a computer system for

representing a class definition, the method comprising defining an opportunity data

model, wherein the defining is performed at an integration server (i.e. Chin teaches an

integration server, (i.e. via page 7 describing the referral system component 4 run by

computers/servers 7a-7d.), the opportunity data model represents an opportunity as

data elements (i.e. at least via Figure 2 and model 200 for the prospect that the overall

invention is related to opportunities in a model where the opportunities are data

elements such as described on page 9, second full paragraph by project manager

module 8 with the referral system 4), the opportunity data model represents identifying a

set of relationships between the opportunity and a plurality of entities related to the

opportunity as attributes of the opportunity (i.e. Page 7, last paragraph; stored in module

8 and the overall model 200 for opportunities wherein Figure 2 clearly shows the

relationships. Module 8 contains the attributes of the opportunity. Further, pages 14

and the description of Figure 2 describes that Chin keeps track of the relationships for

various uses later even though Figure 2 illustratively shows relationships between the

opportunities and the entities), transforming data received from a source application

(i.e. were the source application is the project manager module 8 that "transforms" the

information inputted), wherein the transforming is performed at the integration server

(i.e. referral system 4), the data received from the source application is in a source

format, the transforming transforms the data received from the source format into the

common format, the common format is a format recognized by the integration server

(i.e. via at least the fact that once the information is inputted by the sponsor through the

source application, the information will be displayed in a "common format" within the

system where the data is in the appropriate fields and descriptions have been entered)

the common format facilitates transforming data stored in the common format to data

stored in another format (i.e. may be interpreted as the conversion of the inputted

information system by the sponsor by the information escrow manager module 20

"transforms" the opportunity data/model in a common format where the common format

into "another format" which is the format containing the information that is presented

after the business rules, user preference, and event-specific user permissions have

been implemented,) the data stored in the common format is stored at the integration

server (i.e. where the escrow manager is within the referral system 4 are located), and

the data stored in the another format is stored at a system of one of the entities (i.e. via

at least the distribution of the opportunity to the entity or where the information

presented by the escrow manager to the recipient/candidate). Since Applicant's claims

are largely related to transforming of information formats, rather than the referral system

itself, it should be noted that Chin also talks about messaging engines, publishing

engines, etc. which may alter formats for delivery, etc.

12.   Furthermore, *as defined in Applicant's specification*, the steps of defining and

transforming are considered inherent processes in the Chin prior art since, the entering

of data representing an opportunity is considered the act of "defining" and the

"transformation" is merely a conversion of data from an electronic form in the registers

or memories into a stored, transmitted or displayed format. (This interpretation is further

recited in the Response to Arguments below.) This type of transformation occurs in

every instance in which a computer displays, transmits, or stores information from its

registries or memories common to the function of all computer devices therefore the

transformation, as described by Applicant in the specification, is inherently or implicitly

accomplished through transmission of basic communication by computer. In keeping

with this rationale, the data received from the source application is in a source format,

the transforming transforms the data received from the source format into a common

format, and the common format is a format recognized by the integration server. This

rationale is further discussed in the Response to Arguments.

13.   **With respect to claim 2,** Chin teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the

plurality of entities related to the opportunity includes entities selected from the group

consisting of related accounts, related contact parties, one or more related parent

opportunities, related sales employees and consultants, activities associated with the opportunity, a related source organization, a related destination partner, and related revenue. In the least, the "sponsor type" on page 9 recites things such as activities associated with an opportunity, related source organization, designation partner or even the activities associated with revenue, such as the case with the reward system.

14.   **With respect to claim 3,** Chin teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the data elements comprise a base data element, wherein the base data element is configured to allow one or more non-custom data fields of the opportunity to be defined (i.e. via the minimum information required by the project manager module 8 at page 21, and wherein it is used to contact the sponsor by users), and a custom data element, wherein the custom data element is configured to allow one or more custom data fields of the opportunity to be defined. (i.e. Custom data and data fields are taught on page 7 or 9, allowing for storage in the project manager module.)

15.   **With respect to claim 4,** Chin teaches the method of claim 3 wherein the one or more custom data fields of the opportunity data model are specific to an application. (i.e. page 9 at least for the proposition that the fields are related to the opportunities)

16.   **With respect to claim 5,** Chin teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising: instantiating the opportunity data model; and initializing the data elements of the instantiated opportunity data model. It is clear that Chin is using these data elements with respect to the "opportunity data model" so that they are used, defined, and executed in a properly functioning referral system.

17.   **With respect to claim 6,** Chin teaches the method of claim 5 further comprising,

wherein the transforming the data received from a source application further comprises

transforming the data in the common format into a target format of a target application,

wherein the target format is the another format and the target format represents the

data as another opportunity data model (i.e. to this end, the Examiner has described the

"another target" in claim 1 as the conversion of the inputted information system by the

sponsor by the information escrow manager module 20 "transforms" the opportunity

data/model in a common format where the common format into "another/target format"

which is the format containing the information that is presented after the business rules,

user preference, and event-specific user permissions have been implemented), and

sending the data in the target format to the target application. It is the examiners

position that mapping data is accomplished when, for example, a web browser submits

user provided data to a web browser. For example, when a user submits data through

an HTTP connection or request, the data is mapped into a data structure on the server.

In fact, this is perfect use of XML schema. Therefore, since Chin clearly teaches data

structures and elements and further teaches compatible use over the Internet through

different interfaces, this function is inherent in any Internet communication including that

of Chin. Please refer to claim 1 in defining the "transforming" steps.

18.   **With respect to claim 8,** Chin teaches a method for data transformation, the

method comprising receiving opportunity data from a source application; and

transforming the opportunity data into a common format provided by an opportunity

class, wherein the opportunity class identifies a set of relationships of an opportunity

with a plurality of entities related to the opportunity. Chin teaches the transformation

and storage of the information such that the opportunities are stored and the matching

providers are based on the relationship of the opportunity. For example, entities

interested in a referral for home sales is matched based on similar "opportunity class"

and relationship opportunities. It is the examiners position that this claim is merely

describing a general matching of a referral. (i.e. the thrust of the Chin reference such as

on Page 4.) Please refer to claim 1 when addressing the integration server and

"transforming" steps.

19.   **With respect to claim 9,** Chin teaches the method of claim 8 wherein the

plurality of entities related to the opportunity includes entities selected from the group

consisting of related accounts, related contact parties, one or more related parent

opportunities, related sales employees and consultants, activities associated with the

opportunity, a related source organization, a related destination partner, and related

revenue. As per claim 9, this claim introduces no substantial limitation over that of claim

2 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational.

20.   **With respect to claim 10,** Chin teaches the method of claim 8 wherein the

opportunity class includes a custom data element for defining one or more custom data

fields for the opportunity class. As per claim 10, this claim introduces no substantial

limitation over that of claim 3 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational.

21.   **With respect to claim 11,** Chin teaches a machine-readable medium having

executable instructions to cause a machine to perform a method comprising, defining an

opportunity class representing an opportunity, the opportunity class identifying a set of

relationships of the opportunity with a plurality of entities related to the opportunity. As

per claim 11, this claim introduces no substantial limitation over that of claim 1 and is

therefore rejected under a similar rational.

22.   **With respect to claim 12,** Chin teaches the machine-readable medium of claim

11 wherein the plurality of entities related to the opportunity includes entities selected

from the group consisting of related accounts, related contact parties, one or more

related parent opportunities, related sales employees and consultants, activities

associated with the opportunity, a related source organization, a related destination

partner, and related revenue. As per claim 12, this claim introduces no substantial

limitation over that of claims 2 and 9 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational.

i.e. The Chin reference, in the least, teaches the use of computers on pages 9 and 18.

23.   **With respect to claim 13,** Chin teaches the machine-readable medium of claim

11 wherein the opportunity class includes a custom data element for defining one or

more custom data fields for the opportunity class. As per claim 13, this claim introduces

no substantial limitation over that of claim 3 or 10 and is therefore rejected under a

similar rational.

24.   **With respect to claim 15,** Chin teaches a machine-readable medium having

executable instructions to cause a machine to perform a method comprising, receiving

opportunity data from a source application; and transforming the opportunity data into a

common format provided by an opportunity class, wherein the opportunity class

represents an opportunity and identifies a set of relationships of the opportunity with a

plurality of entities related to the opportunity. It is inherent that Chin's computer systems

have executable instructions or software to perform the function. As per claim 15, this claim introduces no substantial limitation over that of claim 6 and/or 8 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational.

25.   **With respect to claim 16,** Chin teaches the machine-readable medium of claim 15 wherein the plurality of entities related to the opportunity includes entities selected from the group consisting of related accounts, related contact parties, one or more related parent opportunities, related sales employees and consultants, activities associated with the opportunity, a related source organization, a related destination partner, and related revenue. As per claim 16, this claim introduces no substantial limitation over that of claims 2, 9, or 12 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational.

26.   **With respect to claim 17,** Chin teaches the machine-readable medium of claim 15 wherein the opportunity class includes a custom data element for defining one or more custom data fields for the opportunity class. As per claim 17, this claim introduces no substantial limitation over that of claims 3, 10 or 13 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational.

27.   **With respect to claim 18,** Chin teaches a system comprising: a memory; and at least on processor coupled to the memory, the processor executing a set of instructions which cause the processor to define an opportunity class representing an opportunity, the opportunity class identifying a set of relationships of the opportunity with a plurality of entities related to the opportunity. As per claim 15, this claim introduces no substantial limitation over that of claim 1 and/or 11 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational. It is inherent that Chin's computer systems have a processor with

memory to perform the function. (i.e. The Chin reference, in the least, teaches the use of computers on pages 9 and 18.) Additional language not directed to structural components are considered intended use and it is the Examiner's position that the Chin device is capable of performing Applicant's intended use

28.   **With respect to claim 19,** Chin teaches the system of claim 18 wherein the plurality of entities related to the opportunity includes entities selected from the group consisting of related accounts, related contact parties, one or more related parent opportunities, related sales employees and consultants, activities associated with the opportunity, a related source organization, a related destination partner, and related revenue. As per claim 19, this claim introduces no substantial limitation over that of claims 2, 9, 12 or 16 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational.

29.   **With respect to claim 20,** Chin teaches a system comprising: a memory; and at least on processor coupled to the memory, the processor executing a set of instructions which cause the processor to receive opportunity data from a source application, and transform the opportunity data into a common format provided by an opportunity class, wherein the opportunity class represents an opportunity and identifies a set of relationships of the opportunity with a plurality of entities related to the opportunity. As per claim 20, this claim introduces no substantial limitation over that of claim 6, 8 and/or 15 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational.

30.   **With respect to claim 21,** Chin teaches the system of claim 20 wherein the plurality of entities related to the opportunity includes entities selected from the group consisting of related accounts, related contact parties, one or more related parent

opportunities, related sales employees and consultants, activities associated with the

opportunity, a related source organization, a related destination partner, and related

revenue. As per claim 21, this claim introduces no substantial limitation over that of

claims 2, 9, 12, 16 or 19 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational.

31.   **With respect to claim 22,** Chin teaches an apparatus for representing a class

definition, the apparatus comprising: means for defining an opportunity class

representing an opportunity of different types, the opportunity class identifying a set of

relationships of the opportunity with a plurality of entities related to the opportunity. As

per claim 22, this claim introduces no substantial limitation over that of claims 1, 8

and/or 11 and is therefore rejected under a similar rational. It is the Examiner's position

that the structural limitations contained in the means language and defined by Applicant

in the response is inherent in all computer systems.

32.   **With respect to claim 23,** Chin teaches an apparatus for data transformation,

the apparatus comprising: means for receiving opportunity data from a source

application; and means for transforming the opportunity data into a common format

provided by an opportunity class, wherein the opportunity class represents the

opportunity and identifies a set of relationships of the opportunity with a plurality of

entities related to the opportunity. As per claim 23, this claim introduces no substantial

limitation over that of claim 6, 8, 15 and/or 20 and is therefore rejected under a similar

rational. It is the Examiner's position that the structural limitations contained in the

means language and defined by Applicant in the response is inherent in all computer

systems.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

33.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

34.   **Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Chin (WO 01143031).

35.   **With respect to claims 7 and 14,** Chin teaches the method of claim 1 wherein a

definition of the opportunity class is represented as an XML schema. The examiner

takes Official Notice that XML schema is well known in data structures and its primary

purpose is to help information systems share structured data, particularly via the

Internet and internet based communication. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to have utilized XML Schema to

share structured data.

Response to Arguments

36.   Applicant's arguments filed 10/16/2009 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

37.   In addressing Applicants arguments, Applicants primary argument is directed to

similar limitations recited in each independent claim. In particular, Applicant's newly

introduced amendments are presented with rejections under new matter and prior art

rejections as interpreted by the Examiner supra. It should be noted that an majority of

the claims are directed to transforming data from different formats, as the preambles

recite, and are open to a wide variety of interpretation.

38.   Further, Examiner continues to maintain that Applicant's process/system is

inherent in Chin, inasmuch as Applicant has described the invention through Applicant's

specification. While Chin does not explicitly use the term "transformation," the term as

defined by Applicant as merely *"processing" or "computing" or "calculating" or*

"determining" or "displaying" or the like, refer to the action and processes of a computer

system, or similar electronic computing device, that manipulates and transforms data

represented as physical (electronic) quantities within the computer system's registers

and memories into other data similarly represented as physical quantities within the

computer system memories or registers or other such information storage, transmission

or display devices." (i.e. as described in Applicant's specification at [0023-0024].) This

description by Applicant explicitly defines what may be considered "transformation" as

envisioned by Applicant. In this vain, Examiner's previous response repeated herein

states, "there are many references to the sponsor corresponding by e-mail, **or another**

interpretation might be the referral system itself on pages 8-11 *to include* **the**

source application for the referral system in the form of the sponsor login for

entering of information on page 21, lines 6-11 as now partially recited in the

Examiner's new rejections, for the proposition that the source application is the

application that allows for logging in and entering the opportunity into the referral

system..." in response to the source application/format. This was intended to state that

there are several avenues of interpreting what the source application (now: source

format) is considered. Therefore, of the examples provided, email does inherently

include a format change when transmitted over the internet through a server and to the

display of the computer whether it is either a program (i.e. Outlook) or the combination

of a program and physical computer screen display or the computer screen itself. In

particular, the email component of Chin alone inherently includes "binary to text

encoding" as a method of email transmission and transformation. A binary-to-text

encoding is encoding of data in plain text. More precisely, it is an encoding of binary

data in a sequence of ASCII-printable characters. These encodings are necessary for

transmission of data when the channel or the protocol only allows ASCII-printable

characters, such as e-mail. There are several encoding standards for binary-to-text

encodings all of which require the interconversion and transformation of binary data to

readable text and printable characters. This process is utilized by the email "internet

standard" of SMTP/MIME email formats utilizing the binary-to-text encoding scheme.

Informally stated, this is the interchangeable transformation of "0's and 1's" into and out

of readable/displayed text. Regardless, Applicant's expansive definition of

transformation may fit the referral system itself, such as the "determining" or

"calculating" or "computing" or "processing" done by the referral system itself. In short,

any one of the referral system functions such as shown at pg. 23, lines 16-20 may also

be considered a "transformation" or the taking of one set of knowledge (i.e. Applicant's

source format) and determining or processing that information into referrals of any sort

(i.e. the common format). As Applicant states in the specification that "*processing logic*

transforms the opportunity data into a common format provided by the opportunity class

(processing block 304). The opportunity class defines relationships of an opportunity

with various entities related to the opportunity." (i.e. as recited in Applicant's

specification at [0036].) At the most, this statement merely points out that there is initial

data (i.e. source format) that is transformed into a common format. Proper

interpretation of these statements in conjunction with Applicant's definition of

"transformation" may simply include "displaying" in order to satisfy the transformation of

information as similarly indicated above.

Therefore, as recited previously, it is the Examiner's position that the defining is

described in applicant's disclosure as the actual "defining" of the custom data elements

that represent the opportunity as shown in Applicant's specification at [0023-0024]. For

example, defining the parameters or the job such as the type of job, etc. is inherent if

not explicitly recited in the teachings. It is the Examiner's position that this is inherent in

the process of listing a job in the prior art since each category of the parameters of the

job to include compensation will need to be defined for the prospective opportunity

seeker. *Furthermore, the transforming is defined by the Examiner as being "…terms*

such as "processing" or "computing" or "calculating" or "determining" or "displaying" or

the like, refer to the action and processes of a computer system, or similar electronic

computing device, that manipulates and transforms data represented as physical

(electronic) quantities within the computer system's registers and memories into other

data similarly represented as physical quantities within the computer system memories

or registers or other such information storage, transmission or display devices." (i.e. as

recited in Applicant's specification at [0015].) This defines "transformation" of the data

from electronic quantities within the computer systems registers or memories into

stored, transmission, or displayed information. Similarly it is the Examiner's position

that data is inherently transformed from electronic quantities within registers or

memories into stored, transmitted or displayed data. This characterization by the

specification is considered the transformation from source format to common format. It

is believed that the remaining amended independent claims are rejected under a similar

rational and are explained by arguments supra.

Conclusion

39.   The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of

record, within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the

specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the

specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply.

Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as

potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the

passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael M. Thompson whose telephone number is (571)

270-3605. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am-5:30

except Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael M Thompson/

/JOHN G. WEISS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629